



Applicant(s)

Hogrefe et al.

Interview Summary		3
	Examiner Scott Houtteman	Group Art Unit 1656
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTC	) personnel):	
(1) Scott Houtteman	(3)	<del></del>
(2) John Burns	(4)	
Date of Interview May 19, 2000		
Type: ☐Telephonic ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	applicant aplicant's repre	sentative).
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: Yes	№. If yes, brief description:	
Agreement was reached. Was not reached.		
Claim(s) discussed: <u>all pending</u>		
Identification of prior art discussed:  Sorge		
applicant CAN make arguments with respect to the obvious his proposed claims.	ous type double patenting rejectio	
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the ame the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no c is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)	ndments, if available, which the ecopy of the amendents which wou	xaminer agreed would render allowable
1. 🕅 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sepa	arate record of the substance of t	he interview.
Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicat OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has alread INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SU	E THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTI dy been filed, APPLICANT IS GIV	ERVIEW. (See MPEP Section
2. Since the Examiner's interview summary above each of the objections, rejections and requireme claims are now allowable, this completed form is Office action. Applicant is not relieved from provise also checked.	ents that may be present in the lass s considered to fulfill the response	st Office action, and since the erequirements of the last
		SCOTT W. HOUTTEMAN

PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.